

Dublin City Council

December 8, 2014

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Mayor Gerber called the Monday, December 8, 2014 Regular Meeting of Dublin City Council to order at 5:45 p.m. at the Dublin Municipal Building.

ROLL CALL

Members present were Vice Mayor Gerber, Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, Mr. Lecklider and Mayor Keenan.

Staff members present were Ms. Grigsby, Ms. Readler, Ms. Crandall, Mr. McDaniel, Ms. Mumma, Mr. Foegler, Chief von Eckartsberg, Mr. Wagner, Ms. O'Callaghan, Ms. Puskarcik, Mr. Tyler, Ms. Husak, Mr. Gunderman, Mr. Stiffler, Ms. Kennedy, Ms. Burness, Mr. Hahn, Mr. Hammersmith and Mr. Clarey.

ADJOURNMENT TO EXECUTIVE SESSION

Vice Mayor Gerber moved to adjourn to executive session to discuss land acquisition, legal matters, and collective bargaining matters.

Mayor Keenan seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Mayor Keenan, yes.

(Ms. Salay, Mr. Peterson and Mr. Reiner joined the session in progress.)

The meeting was reconvened at 7:15 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher led the Pledge of Allegiance.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

Wallace Maurer, 7451 Dublin Road, expressed thanks to Council members and City management for the very thoughtful sympathy cards he received after the recent death of his son, Jeffrey. They touched him very deeply and he is most appreciative.

Ron Geese, 5584 Brand Road, stated that:

(1) he has forwarded pictures of the intersection off North Street and North High Streets to Council and staff. He has lived in Dublin his entire life. The "no left turn" (northbound on N. High Street) has been removed from the intersection. He asked that the three parking spots along N. High Street be removed, as the sight view for vehicles is completely blocked. Because of his concern, he took the initiative for approaching the Library for their assistance. Previously restricted public parking signage at the Library was removed, and there are now 142 public parking spots within the Library parking lot after 6:00 p.m. on Friday and Saturday. However, his guests and clients remain unable to find parking, because the public parking available at the Library is not being utilized.

(2) on behalf of his mother, he provided Council members with copies of the recently published Dublin pictorial history book. The Charles Mitchell family's main house was built in 1810 at the intersection of Emerald Parkway and Dublin Road, and there is a beautiful, log cabin inside the building there now. He represents the sixth generation of the family, and his children and grandchildren also live in Dublin – a total of eight generations of the Charles Mitchell family to live in Dublin.

On behalf of City Council, Mr. Reiner expressed thanks to Mr. Geese for taking the initiative to remedy the parking problem.

Mr. Geese responded that he would like to request clarification of the process to have the three parking spaces on that corner removed.

Ms. Grigsby stated that the reason those spaces were added was to provide recognition to drivers that they were entering the Historic District, to create an environment that would cause drivers to reduce their speed. Staff has checked to see if the addition of the parking spaces has resulted in any accidents or incidents – to date, there have been none. The "no

left turn" sign was removed quite a few years ago at the request of the Historic Dublin Business Association. Before the sign was removed, however, Engineering staff conducted a gap analysis to ensure that there were sufficient gaps in the traffic to make a left turn from North Street onto N. High Street in this location.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that she believes there is also a left-turn prohibition for traffic exiting the road next to the Library from 4:30 to 6:30 p.m.

Ms. Grigsby stated that staff would provide a staff report for the next Council meeting, including a copy of the engineering traffic gap analysis.

Vice Mayor Gerber requested that the information be provided to Mr. Geese, as well.

Mayor Keenan inquired if there is another method for slowing the traffic in this location. Would the removal of the parking spaces, or at least one or two spaces, really have an impact? He drives there quite often, and it is a very difficult left turn to the north at any time of the day. The sight line is totally blocked.

Ms. Grigsby responded that, prior to this, there were rumble strips in place. Those were not well received due to the noise and were eliminated. Staff will revisit other options available.

Mayor Keenan requested that staff do so and provide a report to Council.

Vice Mayor Gerber thanked Mr. Geese for providing copies of the new book to Council.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Vice Mayor Gerber announced that City Council has selected the new City Manager – Mr. Dana McDaniel. Mr. McDaniel is a strong leader with a great vision, and Council is anticipating the best going forward.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Reiner moved approval of the actions for the eight Consent Agenda items.

Ms. Salay seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes.

1. Approval of Minutes of November 17, 2014 Regular Council Meeting

2. Ordinance 123-14 (Introduction/first reading)

Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Release of Easement for a Sanitary Sewer Easement. (Second reading/public hearing January 5, 2015 Council meeting)

3. Resolution 91-14 (Introduction/vote)

Requesting the Delaware, Franklin and Union County Auditors to Draw Money that may be in the County Treasuries and to Issue a Draft to the Director of Finance of the City of Dublin for Any Money that may be in the Accounts for the City of Dublin.

4. Resolution 92-14 (Introduction/vote)

Consenting to the City of Dublin Working Cooperatively with the Director of the Ohio Department of Transportation for the Upgrade and Maintenance of Traffic Signals.

5. Resolution 93-14 (Introduction/vote)

Accepting the Lowest/Best Bid for the Frantz Road Utility Burial Project.

6. Resolution 94-14 (Introduction/vote)

Declaring Certain City-Owned Property as Surplus and Authorizing the City Manager to Dispose of Said Property in Accordance with Section 37.08 of the Dublin Codified Ordinances.

7. Resolution 95-14 (Introduction/vote)

Authorizing the City Manager to Enter into a Maintenance Agreement with the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) for the Dublin Road/SR 745 and Glick Road Intersection.

8. Acceptance of Final Plat - Celtic Crossing (Case No. 13-063FDP/FP)

SECOND READING/PUBLIC HEARING – ORDINANCES

Ordinance 109-14

Adopting the 2015 Annual Operating Budget, and Declaring an Emergency.

Ms. Mumma stated that operating budget workshops were held on November 5 and 12, and City departments presented 2015 budgets to Council. The expenditures in 2015 are expected to be \$158.3 million, excluding any TIF funds and including transfers and advances out. If that holds true, along with the revenue projected within the General Fund for 2015, the General Fund balance will be nearly 81% of General Fund expenditures, which is well in excess of the 50% level desired. Staff believes that the follow-up memo addresses all of the questions raised during the budget workshops.

Mr. Lecklider stated that he has an objection to one item in the budget for the Community Relations department. He respects staff's proposal, recognizes their diligence in preparation of the budget and believes that they have presented a conservative budget. However, he believes he has a responsibility as a Council member to analyze the proposed budget versus rubber-stamping it. He has reviewed the additional information provided on the subject of the new staff position in Community Relations, but it was not persuasive to him. The original information provided indicated that the individual would be responsible for the social media contents strategies. The additional information provided indicated that the individual's primary responsibility is to support the Police Department. The additional position proposals in the budget were significant relative to those in past years, but there is the acknowledgement that in past years the City has had relatively flat budgets due to economic circumstances. However, his analysis involved what he thought was essential work in the department. If the purpose of this proposed position is to support the Police Department, Council is aware of many models in which the Police Departments use a member of the Police Department to serve as their spokesperson. He believes there are alternatives available for this staffing. He would prefer not to vote against the entire budget, if there is another way to address his objection to that part of the budget.

Mayor Keenan stated that he was not present at the previous meeting when this ordinance was introduced. With respect to process, in the past, during the Finance Committee of the Whole budget workshops, Council has taken action to change, add to or subtract from the proposed budget. He believes the Finance Committee of the Whole meeting is the appropriate time to debate and make those changes. That is the process Council has always operated under and what should continue in the future.

Mr. Lecklider responded that this part of the budget was presented at the first of the two budget hearings. At the end of that meeting, Ms. Grigsby asked if she could provide additional information to support their proposal. Council agreed versus taking a vote without the benefit of that information. The information was provided at the second meeting, but the appropriate staff were not present at that second meeting to discuss the information.

Ms. Salay agreed that there wasn't an opportunity in which to discuss/debate it.

Ms. Grigsby responded that during past budget hearings, Council sometimes expressed objection at the time a position was requested. Over the years, the process changed. It was assumed that if there were any issues with a proposal, Council would raise the issue and discuss it at that time. She would recommend that in the future, as part of the final budget review meeting, the Committee should discuss and vote on each of the recommended positions that are included in the budgets.

Mr. Lecklider stated that this budget review cycle was unusual, as there were a significant number of new positions proposed, as compared to the last four budget cycles due to the economic circumstances at that time.

Ms. Grigsby stated that if the 2015 full-time staff levels are compared to that from 2006, there will still be three less full-time positions.

Mr. Lecklider stated that this proposal could also be compared to 1999 staffing levels.

Mayor Keenan stated that he had some conversation with Ms. Grigsby, as well, in terms of whether the additional position belonged in the Police Department or Community Relations. His understanding is that staff believes it does not make sense to separate the dynamics of that department.

Ms. Grigsby stated that is correct. Staff does not want to begin a process where each department has their own Public Information, Human Resources or Finance staff. It is important to ensure consistency across the City departments. This year, the Police Department requested a public information officer position, and she discussed with the Chief that the preference is to have the position housed in Community Relations. This would ensure a consistent City message at the same time the position is serving the need/ addressing the concerns of the Police Department.

Vice Mayor Gerber inquired if Mr. Lecklider would like to propose a change to the budget by motion, or is simply registering his objection to that part of the budget.

Mr. Lecklider stated that the information regarding the position provided tonight is not consistent with what was previously provided.

Ms. Grigsby stated that Council can make changes to the budget by motion tonight. However, as discussed at the previous meeting, staff's intent was to present a document that did not need to be revised at this point in the review process.

Mr. Reiner noted that he does not believe that it makes good economic sense to add another unionized position in the Police Department. He agrees with adding the position in the Community Relations department.

Mr. Lecklider responded that he was not suggesting the addition of another person to the Police Department. In summary, he respects everyone's opinion and hopes they also respect his.

Mr. Lecklider moved to amend the proposed 2015 operating budget to eliminate the new position proposed in the Community Relations budget.

Ms. Salay seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Reiner, no; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mr. Peterson, no; Vice Mayor Gerber, no; Ms. Salay, yes; Mayor Keenan, no.
(Motion failed.)

Mayor Keenan moved for emergency passage.

Ms. Salay seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes.

Vote on the Ordinance: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes.

Ordinance 110-14

Accepting the Annexation of 2.7 Acres, More or Less in Washington Township Franklin County to the City of Dublin. (Petitioner: Jackson B Reynolds, III agent for Petitioners The Jay W. Liggett Trust, David W. Patch, Jr., Valerie N. Finch, William S. Darling)

Mr. Gunderman stated that this is a request for approval of an annexation of 2.7 acres involving the Liggett property. The property, which is adjacent to the Amlin area, is set back one lot from Rings Road, just east of the railroad tracks. The original rights-of-way have been vacated through the County process, so the area will be annexed without public right-of way. The annexation petition has been approved by Franklin County and if Council approves it, the annexation will be effective 30 days after passage.

Vote on the Ordinance: Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes.

Ordinance 111-14

Amending Chapter 35 of the Codified Ordinances to Revise the Fee and Service Charge Revenue/Cost Comparison System and Establishing a Schedule of Fees and Service Charges for City of Dublin Services, and Declaring an Emergency.

Mr. Stiffler stated that this ordinance establishes the fee schedule for 2015 based on the results of the cost of City services study. In 2014, an inflation measure was used to determine the fee changes with the expectation that in 2015, a full study would be conducted. The proposed fee modifications that resulted from that study are described in the memo and attachments to the ordinance. These modifications were reviewed at the November 12 Finance Committee meeting.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher moved for emergency passage.

Mr. Lecklider seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes.

Vote on the Ordinance: Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes.

Ordinance 112-14

Authorizing the City Manager to Execute Necessary Conveyance Documentation to Acquire 2.04 Acres, More or Less, Fee Simple Interest from Jane M. Jacobs and Thomas C. Jacobs, and Declaring an Emergency.

Ms. Grigsby stated that this ordinance authorizes the acquisition of 2.04 acres of property off Woodland Drive, which is adjacent to the Hutchins tract already owned by the City and used as parkland. The agreed upon price is the appraised value of the property. Approval by emergency action is requested so that the City can close on a portion of the property this year and the remaining portion early next year.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher moved for emergency passage.

Mr. Lecklider seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes.

Vote on the Ordinance: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes.

Ordinance 113-14

Petitioning the County Commissioners of Franklin County, Ohio for Annexation of Approximately Two Acres of Land Located East of High Street, North of Dublin-Granville Road and Adjacent to the Scioto River.

Ms. Grigsby stated that the City acquired this piece of property earlier this year. It is located along Dublin Road and the Scioto River just north of property the City purchased last year. Staff is recommending the property be annexed into the City so that it is under the control of and subject to City enforcement.

Vote on the Ordinance: Mr. Peterson, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes; Ms. Salay, yes.

Ordinance 114-14 (Amended)

Amending Sections 153.057 through 153.066 of the City of Dublin Codified Ordinances (Zoning Code) to Amend the Bridge Street District Zoning Regulations. (Case 13-095ADM)

Ms. Grigsby requested that Mr. Foegler provide additional information related the Bridge Street District, including the reasons for creation of the District, the related issues, and clarify some incorrect information that has been circulating. There have been some comments and concerns expressed, and additional clarification is needed for the public.

Mr. Foegler stated that the Bridge Street project was initiated in 2010, nearly five years ago. There has not been another area of the City that has been as planned, studied, analyzed and publicly engaged as the Bridge Street District. From the earliest stages,

Council has wanted to bring in the leading experts in the field. The City engaged in a full range of fiscal impact and infrastructure analysis, urban design and other kinds of tools, all of which were done as background to inform decision-making. This initiative was based in part on the desire of Council to have a better understanding, given some of the changes the City is confronting in many areas, including economic competitiveness, demographics and changing characteristics of households, and to ensure that Dublin is postured for the next 10-40 years, and can be as successful as Dublin has been over the last 40 years. Many regional efforts are beginning to align with the Bridge Street District plans, including the recent efforts of Columbus 2050. Where Dublin has taken the lead, such as with fiber optics and other initiatives, it seems to stimulate other activity across the region. The new 2050 Initiative reinforces much of the analysis that Dublin conducted early on. When looking at what is projected for central Ohio, it begins to inform regarding the market dynamics that are going to change Dublin. One of the most striking pieces of data from the 2050 Initiative -- and he noted that he has been engaged in that effort - depicts the different drivers for development. Over the last 40 years, development in central Ohio has been heavily driven by the growth of the population segment of heads of households of prime home-buying ages with children. Over the next 40 years, over 80% of the growth in households will be one and two-person households without children -- and therefore, a radically different driver will be pushing development. The consultants have looked at Dublin and the planning and analysis that has been done as not just a regional model, but a national model going forward. Dublin is trying to take steps to address how to remain competitive and respond to the markets of the future. One of the biggest drivers on this for Dublin was economic development. Our study with the Human Resources directors of local companies and others indicated that the lack of housing for young professionals 25-30 years old negatively impacted their ability to attract talent to work in Dublin. Economic development is at the core of Dublin's development activities. Recently, jobs have increasingly gone where that young talent wants to work. Dublin does not have those types of urban, mixed-use, denser environments -- and the Bridge District is meant to address that. Many four-bedroom homeowners with now grown children are looking at other housing options to stay in Dublin. Empty nesters are likely the biggest growing segment of the one and two-person households without kids. From an economic development perspective, where the demographics are heading, and to build upon the core of the City that served a small village with a much more dynamic core, the Bridge Street concept emerged for this six percent of the City land. It will be a very dense, mixed-use walkable grid of development with a variety of housing types that has strategically located office, housing and other supported uses, and captures the quality of the river as an amenity that serves not only that development, but the entire community in a way it never has before. It will provide housing opportunities for a much broader range of the population in the future than we have done in the past. That planning process has been informed by market studies and other types of analysis moving forward.

He noted that some of the information currently circulating is the notion that the Bridge Street project will have 7,000 apartments. Due to the density in the Bridge Street plan, there is a lot of housing and retail/office use. To develop that amount of density to create the walkable activity and vibrancy to support those activities, that significant amount of housing units will be needed over time. The key point is that this density will occur at build out. Just as it took 40 years for Dublin to develop the 15,000, single-family units in place today, the new demographic driving smaller households types will take another 30-40 years of buildout. There is a significant portion of the Bridge Street District that reflects redevelopment sites that will not occur until the economic life of those existing projects runs out, and there is the desire to redevelop the sites for these other purposes.

Another aspect that has been emerging in discussions is that all the projects in the pipeline are apartments. That is simply not correct. With the projects seen thus far, staff has been very impressed with the range and the mixing of uses proposed. The three major ones in the pipeline at this time all align very well with the adopted Community Plan. In those areas where retail and mixing of uses is appropriate, there is a very dynamic mix such as with the Crawford Hoving project that Council has some information about. It includes over 600,000 square feet of non-residential uses, including hotel

concepts and restaurants, conference facilities, etc. Other projects being contemplated on the west side of the river include condominiums, retail, office – and multiple developers are proposing those. The Casto project is in an area recommended for residential; the first phase is purely residential; future phases might have some integrated uses but build importantly across the grid in an urban format that connects and creates the walkability that is important for the District.

Staff is extremely pleased with the level of developer interest, the type of projects, the alignment with the plans, visions and goals that have occurred. Staff is working to create the economic development models, and it is necessary to understand the developments in order to assemble the development agreements. As Council is aware, and as they have been more educated on some new development financing tools emerging, these cannot be considered separately. There is a basic development framework for a project moving forward and there is a financial/economic agreement that supports it. They cannot be looked at in isolation for these larger projects, where the development agreements and plan must go together – the economics are too closely intertwined. As Council will recall, a Letter of Intent process was explored for the Casto Project as one way of trying to arrive at that approach. There will be some other regulations being considered tonight to help align that better -- to ensure that from the earliest stages of the project, the key aspects of development agreements and preliminary project concept ideas are as aligned as possible. Overall, in terms of the concepts moving forward, the public infrastructure investments that won't just serve these projects, but rather all of the citizens of Dublin in terms of the amenities offered to the core, the mixing of uses, the character of the uses being proposed – staff is very pleased. In 2015 -- given the public investment in projects ready to move forward, the private developers ready to move forward, the five years invested by the City in lots of planning, analysis and public engagement with the community and developers -- there will be significant transformational initiatives moving forward.

Mr. Peterson asked about the area east of the river, south of I-270, west of Sawmill Road, north of SR161, which he believes has created most of the controversy that is being discussed tonight. Is the location of that area what allows for a Bridge Street District type project to be proposed? There has been some question raised that the City is abandoning the image of what Dublin is, and that Dublin will transform the City's identity by developing that area. Would a Bridge Street District type development be proposed in an area such as west of Muirfield? Does the current location provide a unique opportunity?

Mr. Foegler responded that this is a unique opportunity for Dublin. In reviewing the growth and development that has occurred in Dublin over the last 40 years, and given the fact that the Bridge Pointe Center struggles, the Bash Golf course never redeveloped, and the Dublin Village Center that has struggled – there is a lot of underutilized land in this area. The normal kind of suburban drivers did not have the opportunities and market demand to occur in this area. Given the demographics emerging and the benefits of creating the development types being discussed, it had tremendous assets going forward. First, the river in the heart that was an underutilized amenity; the visibility from the road system in place; the ability to build upon the historic core and create a 21st century version of those elements. The Bridge Street District is six percent of the City's land – a relatively small percentage – and even if those numbers of residential units do take place, Dublin and all of Central Ohio as of 2050 will still predominantly be the single-family form of residential development that exists in the region. The drivers that are going to be occurring in the next three or four decades are radically different, and that is what will drive the demand for new housing. If Dublin wants to take advantage of the economic development objectives as well as meet the needs of what will be an aging population, and provide alternatives for future buyers of homes in the region, it does a lot for Dublin. The geography of that area is strictly related to the Bridge Street District – those assets and opportunities do not exist elsewhere in Dublin and would not make sense in those other locations.

Mr. Peterson asked if successful, single-family home development could occur in this same area.

Mr. Foegler responded that clearly the market, given the 15,000 single-family units built has not taken us in that direction. He believes some denser single-family homes – maybe some attached units, or more urban in character – could be considered. However, in terms of traditional lower density development, he believes it would be a gross underutilization of that land. Most of the focus has been on the east side of the river, as that is where most of the development activity has initially emerged. There will be some projects on the west side and it will be important to engage the community on those projects as well.

Mr. Peterson asked if he is comfortable with the studies and the data, that everything is still on track, given what has come in.

Mr. Foegler responded affirmatively. Some of the best transportation consultants in the country have been engaged. The grid provides benefit to address many of the traffic needs. A second study indicates that where this grid meets the surrounding road systems, what improvements might have to take place and when – and the tools are in place to handle transportation, traffic and utilities in an extremely capable, well planned way. The City is as poised to handle this development properly and successfully as possible.

Mr. Peterson noted that when Tuller Flats was first discussed, and as mentioned in the memo accompanying Ordinance 114-14, this particular project did not have much mixed use included. He is not aware of anything coming forward with mixed use, so how can the City be assured that the mixed use will come – that the diversity of uses will come forward?

Mr. Foegler responded that not every project and every location lends itself to commercial and other uses being integrated. The plan adopted for the Bridge Street District does not recommend that. The plan as adopted indicates that these kinds of interstitial locations that are between the arterials and not around the edges should be residential. The key is to have the grid and streets like John Shields Parkway, on which a great greenway is being created, to connect to destinations to the west – some of which will be in the Historic District, some in the new Crawford Hoving development along the river, some will be the park amenities – and eventually, the Dublin Village Center redevelopment, which will be a major mode of activity as well. Good connectivity, walkability and markets so that when these restaurants and office uses come about, there is a strong residential market to support it. This is land that was planned for and is totally appropriate for residential. It will reinforce the more dynamic mixing of uses that occurs at those nodes where it is recommended in the plan.

Mr. Peterson stated that, based on this information, his understanding is that the future economic engine will need to be fueled by this type of development.

Mr. Foegler responded that Mr. McDaniel and his staff have done studies and interviewed firms about what needs to be done to keep the City's suburban office parks competitive over time. What is being done with Bridge Street is aligning with all of this information. The regional effort with 2050 has come to the same conclusion. The big advantage for Dublin is that Dublin is far out in front on this – responding to proposals and working to have them fit together. Council has created a framework and plan for how the pieces should fit together, and it is guiding private investment. It is what has inspired private investors to come to Dublin.

Mr. Peterson stated that aside from fueling the economic engine for Dublin, why would other residents of the City desire the Bridge Street District development?

Mr. Foegler responded that most locations in the City that would have a relatively dynamic core, with lots of restaurants, parks lining the river, other kinds of amenities, would add value to nearby residential development. The single-family residential development closest to the dense, walkable mixed-use district will receive the highest bump in value. Residents are gaining the amenities of an urban core nearby without actually being in the District. It is a value add to residential areas in Dublin. The consultants indicated that 75 percent of retail market leaves Dublin to shop elsewhere. Part of the reason is that these options do not exist in Dublin at this time, and people go to the Short North or Easton for a walkable environment with this type of retail and mixed use. If Dublin is to be successful in this endeavor, apartments have to be an important part – bringing young professionals in at an early stage. These same residents will feed into the Dublin homes in the future after being vested into Dublin through the Bridge Street District. Based on demographics, the bubble that fed home sales and valuations over the last 40 years is over. It is a value-

add proposition – the notion of a lifelong community, with young professionals who want to raise a family in a residential neighborhood and retire in Dublin in some empty nester options where there is a walkable environment.

Ms. Salay stated that is also important to emphasize that the planned apartments are targeted for individuals or couples, similar to a development such as Craughwell Village. They are designed to accommodate young professionals and empty nesters and are not the traditional apartment product that is attractive to families. This development will not impact the school district in terms of generating students.

Mr. Foegler responded that another proactive effort Council has taken is working with the School District to establish an agreement to facilitate this development, which has uniquely positioned the City compared with other entities. The demographic information was shared with the Schools as well.

Mayor Keenan stated that it is also important to emphasize the incredible parkland opportunities the Bridge Street development brings. This will be very special.

Mr. Foegler responded that the river park, the pedestrian bridge and some of the amenities emerging around that location will be the defining core of the City. The pedestrian bridge could well be a defining image for the City.

Mr. Reiner commented that he views this as an economic opportunity because the next generation desires to live in a dynamic, exciting location. There is an obligation to provide employees for the companies driving the economic engine for the City. Dublin has a very high standard of living, and it has been funded through planned development and economic development efforts. The District is an important and integral part of the future of the community.

Mr. Foegler responded that Chris Leinberger did a follow-up presentation in the region about a year ago and has been analyzing for the Brookings Institute where this development is occurring. Most is occurring in suburbs and will continue to do so. There is still a substantial segment of population that is seeking a suburban location, but there is lack of a suburban form of an urban development in Dublin. In the analysis of valuations per acre, the valuations are conservatively 10 times per acre what they would be under conventional suburban development. The additional tax valuation to the Schools will be extraordinary, as there will be very few additional students generated with this type of development.

Ms. Grigsby noted that the City and City Council has worked very hard to ensure that the information is provided and available to the residents – with speakers, public forums, study sessions, community surveys – and the surveys indicated a high level of knowledge and support for the Bridge Street District development, particularly the river park and pedestrian bridge. Good feedback has been provided by the community overall indicating they are in favor of this type of development.

Vice Mayor Gerber stated that, going forward, perhaps the residents could be better informed about the various projects as they are taking place.

Ms. Grigsby responded that staff does work hard to share information, with workshops on the potential developments. Tonight, there is legislation on the agenda relating to one of the proposed developments. The website contains an enormous amount of information about the Bridge Street District, including responses to frequently asked questions. These are updated continually, based on e-mails from residents, who are referred to the website.

Mr. Lecklider stated this has been a public process over many years, and the concepts are not new to Council, the Planning Commission, the public and development community. There is nothing occurring “behind the scenes” regarding this matter. Each and every member of Council firmly supports the direction the City is headed with respect to the Bridge Street District. With respect to the Bridge Street Code amendments on the agenda tonight, the changes proposed have been thoroughly reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission over a number of months. The one significant change being proposed by City

Council is to allow Council the discretion to take upon itself a review at the initial level. The rationale behind this is based on the very significant investment involved. These are policy decisions, and ultimately, the body held accountable is City Council – not an appointed body. Council believes this is appropriate basis for taking this step. Whatever applications Council reviews in the future will be reviewed in public meetings. The majority of Council members have previously served on the Planning and Zoning Commission, and are very familiar with reviewing such development plans. Because of the financial investment involved in the projects, City Council will likely scrutinize these projects very carefully. Council will not review every project that comes forward, but will have the discretion to determine this. All of Council is very excited about the Bridge Street District, and Council has a tradition of staying ahead of the curve. For all the reasons Mr. Foegler and the consultants have stated over many years and many meetings, he is anticipating moving forward with the Bridge Street District development.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher agreed with Mr. Lecklider's comments. The Planning and Zoning Commission has been working on the BSD Code revisions over many months and have had special meetings exclusive to this topic. The major changes being recommended tonight came from the Commission. The only changes Council is making is to include Council in the process, specifically for those cases that require a development agreement. These financial matters are not the purview of the Commission, but are Council's purview. She is concerned that people have commented that Council is rushing these amendments, when in reality, the Commission has very carefully reviewed the BSD Code and has recommended some changes to Council.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Langworthy stated this is the second reading/public hearing of Ordinance 114-14 related to the Bridge Street Code amendments. Some of the amendments were discussed at the first reading, and he can respond to those. Tonight, he will focus on the changes requested by Council. During the first reading discussion, items raised related to some of the recommendations of the Commission. Some of those matters will be discussed in a Commission work session on Thursday, December 11. Another issue raised was the master sign plan review procedures. The last issue related to the process changes.

- Council's requested amendments to the process are only applicable to projects that also require a development agreement.
- The first step in the existing process is the Basic Plan Review, and includes the development plan and site plan. The amendment would move the approval for Basic Plan Review from Planning and Zoning Commission to Council and would require two actions by Council: action on the Basic Plan itself and action regarding who the required reviewing body would be for the formal development plan and site plan going forward. The choices would include: Council; the Administrative Review Team; Planning and Zoning Commission; or for projects in the Historic District, the Architectural Review Board.
- For the master sign plan, similar changes were made. Council during its review of the Basic Plan would also determine the required reviewing party for the master sign plan with the same options.
- Council would also determine the required reviewing body for conditional uses that would take place for projects requiring development agreement. The three bodies that could review these are Council, Planning Commission, and Architectural Review Board – which is actually a recommending body to the Commission in that situation for projects within the Historic District.
- Another change requested by Council is to provide a more direct appeal process. Currently, there is an administrative appeal process available, which goes from the deciding body to the Board of Zoning Appeals with a potential outlet to Council if the applicant is not in accord with the decision of BZA. This provides for direct appeal to Council by the applicant or to any adverse decision by the ART, P&Z, ARB, and BZA. There are some Director decisions and CBO decisions, which can also be appealed to Council.

- In regard to size-limited uses and housing diversity, there are no further Code amendments recommended. Those will be discussed at the Commission work session.
- For tree related issues and planting related issues, the City Forester will address those and they will be discussed at the Commission work session.
- For signs, no amendments are recommended, but there has been discussion of assembling a set of sign guidelines to provide guidance to sign manufacturers or owners. This would provide an opportunity to clarify the type of signage encouraged/permitted in the District as well as what is discouraged.

Staff is recommended Council approval of Ordinance 114-14 (Amended).

Ms. Salay asked about the sign guidelines or pattern book. When would that be available for review?

Mr. Langworthy responded that staff can provide this in the first quarter of 2015.

Vice Mayor Gerber stated that in a situation where there is a development agreement required, Council will review the basic development plan and site plan, and then determine what body will review it – Council, ART, P&Z, ARB, BZA. What criteria will Council utilize in the decision about the appropriate body for review?

Mr. Langworthy clarified that it will likely be on a case-by-case basis. His view would be that the level of infrastructure necessary and level of investment by the City necessary would be part of the criteria, and how that investment is tied to the development itself might give weight to Council's decision.

Mr. Reiner commented regarding the tree issue, which was controversial. In view of the Emerald Ash borer, there has been an effort to alternate trees and use many species. However, a key factor in landscape architecture is the unifying element of having one species of tree on a street. A street tree can be a unifying element, and he does not support planting 15 different species of trees.

Mr. Langworthy responded that he agrees, and the various areas can be identified using street trees to delineate the changing character of the roadway.

Mr. Peterson commented there was an enormous amount of material accompanying this legislation. The legislation itself is only 10 pages, correct?

Ms. Grigsby responded that much of the information is background information on the Code. The legislation is simply the ordinance and memo provided by staff.

Mr. Langworthy added that redlined and clean copies are provided so that Council can more easily identify the changes.

Public Testimony

Kevin Walter, 6289 Ross Bend stated that there has been conversation tonight about time, which is an elusive thing – sometimes there is too much, and sometimes too little. Council members were all elected as stewards of the City of Dublin – of the past and the future. He cited *Dublin's Journey*, which speaks to the value of time in the development process of Dublin's future. It walks the reader from the start of the City to modern day, with key events listed. It depicts the slow and arduous process that brought about modern day Dublin. He recalls the Chair of the Planning and Zoning Commission talking with him, as a member of the Commission, about the delicate balance between development goals and what is best for the City of Dublin. The process in place over the years has created a truly idyllic community that all can be proud of. Today's discussion subverts that process. He has listened intently to the discussions over the last five years about the Bridge Street District. The discussion centered on the need for speed, to ensure the development community is confident in Dublin's sincerity to move forward with projects in the District and that the development community has what it needs to successfully complete these projects. The Commission provides valuable time in the development process – time for Dubliners to think about their future, time for City staff to work with developers, time for developers to bring their best projects forward – not just the projects they believe they can get through the process. Council speaks of development agreements as the reason to cut out the Planning and Zoning Commission; in fact, what Council is doing is solidifying

the economic interests of the developer, trumping the public's ability to participate in the process. He asked that Council carefully discuss the concept of time this evening, and think about *Dublin's Journey* and the value that time has brought to the community. He asks that Council provide the time needed to build the best Dublin possible.

Alison Close Myers, 7630 Bellaire Avenue provided a copy of her remarks to Council. She noted she has been following the Bridge Street District process for five years and watches the live streaming of meetings provided by the City. She is a concerned citizen who loves the City in which she grew up and where she lives today. She lived in Chicago for 4-5 years in an area of high density, but felt pulled back to Dublin and chose to live in Dublin and raise her family with her husband. She is not anti-development and is excited to have new life in the Bridge Street corridor. She does want to see this is done right. However, she recently has become concerned that developers are pressuring City Council to get this done and get this done their way as soon as possible. Her main issue is with the change in the process – an existing process that requires developers to work with the City in such a way that Dublin's high standards are met. Large projects such as this add true long-term value to the community. The review process in place has resulted in Dublin being one of the finest communities in the country. Dublin does not have bright signs and vacant big box stores, but has green space for everyone to enjoy. Her concern is with making fundamental changes to a proven process that will affect every project in the future. Taking the review and decision making process out of the hands of the Planning and Zoning Commission and the ARB erases a check and balance that has been in place as long as Dublin has been a city. While this may help expedite projects, she would hate to have a rushed project resulting in a lesser project that all have to live with for a long time.

Ron Geese, 5584 Brand Road asked what is the process tonight? Will there be a vote on the Ordinance? The posting of the 460 pages on Friday should have been done prior to the first reading. Current drawings are not posted correctly and are not up to date. The current P&Z process works. Why change a process in place for 38 years that provides a check and balance system that has created a state-of-the-art city? The creation of an ART review process moves the development review out of the public view. P&Z provides a public check and balance system. If Council is not satisfied with appointed Commission members and what they do, Council should discuss with them what needs to be done differently. Developers always have complained about the zoning process in all cities. Current Dublin is not any different. He has questions about the tax increment financing and if the Franklin County Children's Services funding will be impacted, the Library, Columbus Metro Parks and Columbus Zoo. He reference an article from the paper, dated September 3, 2014 indicating that monies are being given away by the City that are not the City's to give. These entities are entitled to the percentages of taxes they are to receive.

Ms. Grigsby responded that for any tax increment financing districts set up by the City and any tax exempt districts established, the tax revenue – or payments in lieu of that tax revenue – would either come to the City or be paid to the development to fund infrastructure improvements needed to support the project, such as structured parking. Anytime the City has set up TIF districts, those dollars have been used to fund public infrastructure. The dollars are therefore deferred for the various entities. But in most cases, had the incentive districts not been established and the public improvements not completed, the development would not have moved forward. TIFs are a tool that the State of Ohio has provided to local governments in order to create a revenue stream or source that allows the development to help fund the improvements and the infrastructure needed to support their development.

Mr. Geese stated that there are entities such as Metro Parks, Children's Services, Columbus Zoo and the Library that are entitled to their small percentages. It is not Council's right to give those taxes to a developer.

Mr. Lecklider added that his understanding of a TIF is that the property taxes collected today will continue to be collected going forward. These revenues will continue to be provided to the various entities. The funds generated from the TIF are a result of the increase in the value of that property as a result of the development and are directed

toward improvements supporting the development. Nothing is being taken away from the entities, as they will continue to receive their present allocation.

Mr. Geese stated that this is not correct, based on what he has read in the newspaper.

Future development needs to pay its share of funding to these various levies.

Ms. Grigsby stated that only the incremental increase is used to fund the improvements needed to support the project. Any new increment allows that development to occur. Once these TIFs expire, a significantly increased tax base results, positively impacting all of the entities Mr. Geese has referenced. A good example is the construction of Emerald Parkway Phase 1 and 2. If the City had not established a TIF to build the roadway, utilizing the tax revenues from the buildings constructed by Cardinal Health and Verizon, the City could not have funded the roadway at that time. The other key point is that the individual developers continue to pay their fair share – it is simply a payment in lieu of tax or a fee set by a New Community Authority. It only involves the incremental increased value – not the current value on which the payments to the various entities are based.

Vice Mayor Gerber stated that for a property valued at \$100,000 today, the landowner will continue to pay taxes on that value to all of those entities; with further development and an increased value, the increased taxes will fund the infrastructure needed to support the new development.

Mr. Peterson added that if a TIF were not established, the taxpayers of the City would be funding those infrastructure improvements.

Mr. Geese commented that the City did approve payments to the School District so that they were not adversely impacted. He is only concerned with the other entities who will not receive their “fair share.” He asked again if Council will vote on this legislation tonight.

Vice Mayor Gerber responded that this is a second reading of the Ordinance, and Council will determine what action they want to take at this time. It is not proposed as emergency legislation – it is simply a second reading/public hearing, and this is generally when the vote is taken.

Mr. Geese commented that it is impossible to view the river from the east side due to the honeysuckle. The City should use the funding generated to remove this honeysuckle.

Mayor Keenan stated that a memo in the packet discusses the proposed removal of this invasive plant along the river.

Mr. Lecklider noted that one question by Mr. Geese related to the 460-page document on the website.

Mr. Langworthy responded that there is a redlined and clean version of the Code, and an extensive history of the Code.

Ms. Salay added that these documents were online for the first reading in November as well. These documents were posted at that time and posted again on Saturday night at the website. The process has been completely public.

Ms. Grigsby noted that the only new information was the direction given by Council at the first reading; all of the other information was posted on the website and included in Council packets. Due to the size of this packet and the Thanksgiving holiday, the packet was not sent out until Friday and the website updated on Saturday.

Vice Mayor Gerber summarized that tonight, Council is reviewing the procedures and criteria on a limited basis with respect to applications that involve a development agreement in the Bridge Street District. Council will also provide input about the changes proposed by the Planning and Zoning Commission. There are also some proposed changes related to the appeal process. He asked if there are any other items before Council tonight.

Mr. Langworthy stated this is correct.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher clarified that included in all of the documentation are minutes from various boards and commissions that have been posted on the City's website after those meetings of the respective board or commission. In regard to the tax increment financing districts and impacts on entities receiving property tax levy funds, she asked for verification: property owners will pay the same property taxes they are currently paying

based on the current value; only the increase in property valuation as a result of the new development will be used for infrastructure improvements.

Ms. Grigsby stated that for any new development that occurs, the value of that land will still be taxed and funds distributed to all the entities as they are today; only the incremental increase and revenues generated will come to the City or go toward the development.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher noted that the entities can continue to rely upon the funds they are presently receiving from the property owners.

Ms. Grigsby stated that is correct.

Mayor Keenan added that the township never received any monies to support the fire department from all of the tax increment financing districts that were established over many years; however, after the various TIFs expired, the township gained the benefit of the increased property tax value. The development is the economic engine that supports everything the City does.

Ms. Salay stated that it is important to point out that the Bridge Street District is only six percent of the City land. The increased value in the future will have major impacts on these entities.

Roger Vogel, 177 Longview Street stated that it would help to understand what is the timeframe of the TIFs.

Ms. Grigsby responded that TIFs are allowed to run for 30 years or until the improvements that have been identified as being supported by the TIF are paid for, and the City is reimbursed.

Mr. Vogel stated that it does not last indefinitely; it does end.

Ms. Grigsby responded affirmatively.

Ms. Salay noted that the City has had some that are now expired.

Mr. Reiner stated that there is a County oversight group that reviews items such as the TIFs annually.

Mr. Peterson requested clarification. This amendment to this Code only reflects this procedure with respect to Bridge Street and only with respect to a project that has a development agreement.

Mr. Lecklider stated that is also within Council's discretion. Council may or may not reserve that option for itself.

Mr. Peterson stated that there have been questions and comments that projects reviewed by the Administrative Review Team would not have the same public review process.

Mr. Langworthy responded that all the same notice requirements apply as would apply to Planning and Zoning Commission. Even if Council reviews the project through certain stages, all the public notice requirements that apply to Planning and Zoning Commission would apply.

Mr. Peterson stated that the current procedure may also remain – the Planning and Zoning Commission may review all these projects just as they always have.

Mr. Langworthy responded that is correct. Council may determine that at the Basic Plan review stage.

Ms. Salay clarified that the ART meetings are also public meetings and are noticed to the public.

Mr. Langworthy responded that is correct.

Mr. Lecklider stated that he appreciates the citizen comments this evening, which are the result of the citizens caring about their community. In regard to the comments with respect to time – he finds it difficult to understand how there are some who believe Council is moving too quickly, when these concepts have been studied by Council for five years. He also served on the Planning Commission for five years, and there was no project -- Cardinal Health, Ballantrae, or any other -- that took five years to make its way through the review process. Also, the suggestion that IF Council reserves unto itself this review, that would be something less than might have been otherwise experienced. He would suggest that those individuals go back and review the minutes for the past year or so

related to the Tuller Flats project and ask the applicant if they thought their hearings before Council were easy. The answer to that is "no." These projects are going to receive a level of scrutiny from this body certainly equal to the review they would receive at Planning and Zoning Commission or with any other body.

Ms. Salay stated that she wanted to read her response to an email she received earlier today about the process, because it addresses some of the concerns.

"I wanted to take a moment to assure you that Council's intent is not to limit the public's involvement in decisions surrounding future development in the Bridge Street District. To the contrary, we have had over 30 public meetings, workshops, charrettes, guest speaker events in the past 4 ½ years to discuss this important vision. We will continue to invite public input, as has always been our tradition, and in fact, our law, in Dublin, whether that be at a City Council meeting, a Planning Commission meeting, an Architectural Review Board meeting, a Board of Zoning Appeals meeting, a Community Services Advisory Commission meeting, an ART meeting, or any other public meeting or venue we have -- expressly to ensure that our citizens are connected to and part of the decision-making process in Dublin. To say we are somehow interested in shortcutting, hiding, or taking away the public process is a gross misstatement that has unfortunately been emailed around the City today. If something seems uncharacteristic, crazy, off-base or contrary to what you have come to know about Dublin, then it probably is. The only change proposed in review of the Bridge Street Code amendments that were passed by Planning and Zoning Commission in November after a month of their review is to bring the first step in the review process -- the Basic Plan Review, to City Council rather than the Planning and Zoning Commission, and this would only be for the larger projects that will involve some type of development agreement with the City of Dublin, which would have to be voted on by City Council, as well. Council would like the opportunity to have the first look at those proposals to see if they meet our expectations for quality design, land use, density, layout, public space, streetscape, etc. before we enter into agreements with developers to facilitate the building of the public infrastructure, such as roadways, stormwater facilities, public areas, etc. After Council gets this look at the projects in the public meeting with opportunity for public review and comment, we will send the project to the appropriate body for review, and the public process will continue. I have been a Council representative to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the past eight months, and we have had six to eight public meetings concerning Bridge Street District projects or the Bridge Street zoning code itself. I have been on City Council since the inception of the idea for the Bridge Street District in 2009. I, and the rest of City Council have been open, transparent, and very desirous of citizen voices and involvement for that entire time. Please contact me and the rest of City Council to let us know your thoughts. Your involvement in this City has been helpful, and I speak for all of Council when I say her your voice and the voice of all residents is important."

She believes all Council members share those sentiments.

Vice Mayor Gerber stated that everyone on this Council has worked very hard on the Bridge Street Corridor Plan and is very committed to it. As he looks through this document, he appreciates all the work that has been done. He is very pleased to see the clarification related to the appeal process. He appreciates the Planning and Zoning Commission's hard work; they have vetted this document thoroughly in public meetings. The one concern he has with the document is with respect to where does Council send this and under what criteria. He would like to see this document address those issues. It is early in the process, but it appears that there are different expectations of each body of review, and that could drive differing results. He is not saying that is occurring, but potentially, it could. From that standpoint, he would like to see more definition of the criteria by which we refer this to ART, PZC, etc. That is his only concern with this, and he is not sure how to address that. He understands the financial side. The world has changed

since 2008, and developers need to address the financial component earlier. However, we have built a fine City by setting an incredibly high “bar” in the City Code. Even with Code requirements, there are still subjective areas where the City needs to make sure the project comports well with the surrounding areas. He infers from that the City’s core value. If Council selects one of these bodies to refer a project to, he is unsure of the criteria and how to ensure the provisions of the Code are met.

Mr. Langworthy stated that there are two parts to his response. One, the review of the plan itself is guided by the criteria listed in the plan. Second, at some point, there is a need for better guidance from Council as to which projects should go in what direction. Some of that clarification may take place over time as we learn Council’s individual preferences for projects as they go through the process. It is difficult for staff to define the criteria Council should use to pass the review on, or keep it. Third, the Basic Plan itself has a very good opportunity to “set the stage” for what happens next. Doing the best possible job at the Basic Plan level will define the expectations concerning architectural layout, landscaping, etc. for whatever body reviews it next. He would not discount the value of the Basic Plan Review process, for it will determine what occurs thereafter. The information Council passes forward to the next reviewing body will impact their review.

Vice Mayor Gerber inquired if “setting the stage” means the Basic Plan review would establish what would be required.

Mr. Langworthy responded that the site plan and development plan must follow what the Basic Plan has laid out. There are details, however, that are not covered by the Basic Plan review, which would need to be resolved.

Vice Mayor Gerber stated that he has previously described the Basic Plan, using PUD terms, as lying somewhere between the preliminary development plan and the concept plan -- more detailed than a concept plan, but less detailed than the preliminary development plan.

Vote on the Ordinance: Mr. Reiner, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, no; Mr. Lecklider, yes.

Ordinance 117-14

Authorizing the Provision of Certain Incentives to Exact Holding North America, Inc. to Induce it to Locate an Office and Associated Operations and Workforce within the City, and Authorizing the Execution of an Economic Development Agreement.

Mr. Clarey provided a brief summary. Exact Software is a software development and consulting firm, based in the Netherlands, with several locations overseas and in the U.S. This economic development agreement is in response to the company’s conducting a national real estate search for an expanded U.S. headquarters. The company plans to locate 100 employees to Dublin in 2015 and create an additional 15 jobs over the next three years. This accounts for approximately \$1.2 million in net income tax withholdings over the seven-year term of the lease. He introduced Mr. Robin Foster, General Counsel for Exact Software.

Robin Foster, General Counsel, Exact Software, stated that as a Dublin resident, he believes this is a wonderful community, and they are anticipating a decision that will allow them to invest further in the community with some very important jobs. As stated in the agreement, Exact Software will bring jobs to the City of Dublin that will average \$83,000 per year. They are significant jobs – attorneys, sourcing and procurement staff. Their decision to invest and locate in Ohio and this community is in part because of the economic incentives, but also because of the resources that communities such as Dublin offer; the resources that universities, such as OSU offer for I.T. development; and organizations such as Tech Columbus offer as an incubator for their company. Exact Software has an annual growth revenue of approximately \$300 million/year; one quarter to one third of that is based on American revenues. The company has five business units operating in the Americas, including locations in Silicon Valley, Boston, Minneapolis and a Columbus business unit, which was founded in Marion, Ohio. Dublin is a terrific option, which is why they are before Council today.

Vice Mayor Gerber noted that he viewed information about Exact Software online and learned that it is a very dynamic company. Council welcomes them to the Dublin community.

Vote on the Ordinance: Ms. Salay, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes.

INTRODUCTION/FIRST READING – ORDINANCES

Ordinance 115-14

Authorizing the Execution of a Development and Tax Increment Financing Agreement to Facilitate the Construction of a Residential Development and Provide for the Construction of Public Infrastructure Improvements Relating Thereto. (Casto Tuller LLC) (Second reading/public hearing January 5, 2015 Council meeting)

Ms. Salay introduced the ordinance.

Mr. Foegler stated that this is the agreement for the Tuller Flats project. It is consistent with the Letter of Intent, which was authorized by City Council in October. Companion legislation will also be before Council tonight that establishes the associated TIF districts. This does not substitute for or is subservient in any way to the development review process required for the project. It establishes the basic economic terms, similar to the process Council discussed earlier, that define how this project would move forward. The general aspects of this project are fully consistent with the information provided at the October Council meetings and with Council's October 27 action related to the Letter of intent. Although there are references to future phases, nothing in this agreement limits or applies in any meaningful way to future phases of the project.

The private improvements that are identified include 420 units of multi-family housing with the minimum taxable value of \$20 million. It is important to note that minimum amount is established to relate to and support the minimum service payment guarantees that accompany this project. Staff anticipates actual future valuations to be significantly higher than that, as trends suggest. There are some criteria with regard to performance timeframes. Among the items that this project is leveraging for the City is the John Shields Parkway extending from Village Center Parkway to relocated Riverside Drive – an estimated cost of \$10.1 million. In addition, the City would assume the obligation for a very small section of interior streets. For all the other streets, the developer will pay the first \$1.15 million; the City contributes the next \$2.5 million, as outlined in the LOI. Any costs in excess of \$3.65 million, would be the developer's responsibility. The developer is dedicating all the right-of-way for this project at no cost to the City, which includes the right-of-way for John Shields Parkway and the internal streets. One of the unique features of this project is the parkland exchange that led to the land exchange that is embodied. In effect, the developer is dedicating a 1.9-acre major park in conformance with open space requirements for their project, but there is also a trade of real estate, in which the City will provide some of its legacy parkland along Tuller Ridge Drive, approximately 1.4 acres, to the developer. In exchange, the City will receive 1.3 acres of prime frontage to continue implementation of the John Shields greenway along the project. The other benefit of that is, in keeping with the previous MKSK proposal, it allows buildings to frame this very important signature street as our urban design objectives will continue to do. The land swap provisions are established in this agreement as well, which are consistent with the Letter of Intent. With regard to future development, the exhibits depict an additional eight-acre option that the developer has on the Thomas property as phase 2. It also shows the areas of buy-back provisions on the previous Byers property, now owned by the City, which could be acquired by the developer for a future phase. The commitment within this agreement is that those will be pursued with mixed-use development, approaching the more intense activity centers to the west. The developer was fully cooperative in helping the City realign John Shields Parkway consistent with the City's urban design principles for this area. They initially secured the site control of the Byers site for the City under good terms and have some rights to acquire within a period of time the land that the City does not need for right-of-way or greenspace as part of the development, subject to plan reviews and approvals. The minimum service payment obligation will no longer apply to the developer at such time as the appraised value of the TIF equals 130% or more of the

value used to calculate the minimum service payment for a period of four consecutive years. The developer has the obligation to follow through on the required steps to establish the TIF district and make those payments.

In regard to the school impacts, this project is covered by the Bridge Street District Cooperative Agreement that was entered into by the schools and the City of Dublin. For the first 15 years, it provides 100% of the applicable real estate taxes -- years 2016 – 2030. Effectively, 90% can be captured to go toward these improvements. With the minimum service payments, in phase one, with current millage, that would be over \$700,000 annually for the first 15 years, about \$655,000 in the real estate for the second 15 years. These are very conservative estimates.

One of the important public benefits of the project is that leveraging the design, construction and completion of John Shields Parkway as a key east-west signature roadway in the Bridge Street District will provide for implementation of one of the most important roadway elements in the District. It will also facilitate the timely removal of the Tuller Road intersection with Riverside Drive's full turning movements in all directions. With the completion of Emerald Parkway and the relocation of Riverside Drive, the Tuller Road intersection will become right turns in and out only. Those movements will be replaced by John Shields Parkway to facilitate the full continuity of that roadway all the way to Village Center Drive. What it will accomplish in advancing the greenway is also a plus. The general approach to establishing the grid with urban-type buildings lining the roadway appropriately, subject to Planning's review, must still go forward. This is in full compliance with the vision and goal for the Bridge Street District.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher inquired if this phase of John Shields Parkway ends at Dublin Village Parkway, or does it extend to Sawmill Road.

Mr. Foegler responded that it will end at Dublin Village Parkway, which will provide the continuity to Sawmill Road. This phase does not include any of the internal Dublin Village Center developments. In conjunction with the other piece of real estate being acquired from the Wendy's corporate facility, which is scheduled for the next Council meeting, there will be both east-west movements, full continuity, from Riverside Drive with that right-of-way in place.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that there is a need to clarify that -- even though the City does not know what the mixed-use development will ultimately be -- it is not intended that this area would be built as strip retail.

Mr. Foegler responded that is correct. It would not be compatible with the vision.

Mr. Lecklider requested clarification of the minimum service payments addressed in staff's memo.

Ms. Mumma responded that in contemplating a development agreement, staff considers the level of infrastructure that will be necessary for the City to provide. If certain roadway improvements will be necessary for the development, staff must determine what the development is worth. Including a minimum service payment in the agreement ensures that the City will receive a service payment of a specified dollar amount, which will be designated to pay for the infrastructure improvements. By including a minimum service payment, it ensures the developer will make service payments of a certain dollar amount even if their property is not valued as expected.

Mr. Lecklider stated that, looking at the proposed agreement, the first building permit is issued in 2015, and the first minimum service payment would be computed based on applicable real property taxes for tax year 2018. Is that to allow for some increase in value?

Ms. Mumma responded that it will allow time for the developer to construct the project before they begin payments.

Mr. Lecklider stated that he presumes that the property would also be valued higher.

Ms. Mumma responded that it is anticipated that the value of this development will be higher than \$20 million, but this minimum service payment sets the floor amount.

There will be a second reading/public hearing at the January 5, 2015 Council meeting.

Vice Mayor Gerber moved to waive the Rules of Order in order to discuss Ordinance 116-14 and 118-14 together.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes.

(The Clerk read the titles into the record.)

Ordinance 116-14

Declaring the Improvement to Certain Parcels of Real Property in the City's Bridge Street District to be a Public Purpose and Exempt from Taxation; Providing for the Collection and Deposit of Service Payments and Specifying the Purposes for which Those Service Payments May be Expended; Specifying the Public Infrastructure Improvements Directly Benefitting the Parcels; and Authorizing Compensation Payments to the Dublin City School District and the Tolles Career and Technical Center.

Ordinance 118-14

Declaring the Improvement to Certain Parcels of Real Property in the City's Bridge Street District to be a Public Purpose and Exempt from Taxation; Providing for the Collection and Deposit of Service Payments and Specifying the Purposes for which Those Service Payments May be Expended; and Authorizing Compensation Payments to the Dublin City School District and the Tolles Career and Technical Center.

Ms. Mumma stated that Mr. Foegler provided information relevant to this project, but she clarified that two separate TIFs would be created. Under the statute for TIFs, there is a section that deals with using the service payments to fund public infrastructure improvements, which is how all of Dublin's TIF districts have been created in the past. There is also another section, the .41 TIF, that allows the service payments generated in a particular TIF area to be used not only for public infrastructure improvements but also for private improvements. One of the conditions for service payments being collected and used in that manner is for the City to hold title to that particular parcel prior to the legislation being approved. For this development, the City is the owner of the Byers property. Because of that, the City can be allowed the flexibility to use those service payments generated on that property -- once it develops -- to possibly fund some private improvements, such as parking structures, that may be in the Bridge Street District TIF area. In any TIF legislation, staff outlines the public infrastructure improvements, as well as the defined area, but this will allow the City more flexibility as to how those dollars are used in this particular area.

There will be a second reading/public hearing at the January 5, 2015 Council meeting.

Ordinance 119-14

Establishing Appropriations Based on the 2015 Operating Budget of the City of Dublin, State of Ohio, for the Fiscal Year Ending December 31, 2015. (Annual Appropriations Ordinance) (Request to dispense with public hearing)

Mr. Lecklider introduced the ordinance.

Ms. Mumma stated that this establishes the appropriations in accordance with the Operating Budget that was approved earlier this evening with Ordinance 109-14.

Vice Mayor Gerber moved to dispense with the public hearing.

Mr. Lecklider seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes.

Vote on the Ordinance: Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes.

Ordinance 120-14

Authorizing the City Manager to Enter into an Agreement with the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) to Finance the I-270/US 33 Improvement Project through the State Infrastructure Bank Program, and Declaring an Emergency. (Request to dispense with public hearing)

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher introduced the ordinance.

Ms. Mumma stated that this legislation authorizes the City Manager to execute an agreement with the State Infrastructure Bank. The last few years, the City has been working with ODOT and MORPC on funding for the interchange. The construction is slated to begin in early 2015. In anticipation, the City is shoring up the funding -- \$35 million of which will come from the State Infrastructure Bank Program. An additional \$25 million will be funded by MORPC, and the remaining amount of \$10 million will be paid by the City of Dublin. Additional legislation will be proposed in January that will have the final documents provided by ODOT for the program. The City will be using service payments within the Ruscilli, Pizzuti and Upper Metro TIFs to make these payments for the construction of the interchange.

Mr. Reiner moved to dispense with the public hearing and treat as emergency legislation.

Ms. Salay seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes.

Vote on the Ordinance: Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes.

Ordinance 121-14

Authorizing the City Manager to Execute Necessary Conveyance Documents to Acquire a 0.011 Acre, More or Less, Permanent Easement and a 0.006 Acre, More or Less, Temporary Easement from E. Elaine T. Horr, Trustee of The E. Elaine T. Horr Revocable Trust Executed March 12, 2009, for the Property Located at 8668 Hyland-Croy Road for the Construction of a Shared-use Path Connection, and Declaring an Emergency. (Request to dispense with public hearing)

Mr. Lecklider introduced the ordinance.

Ms. Grigsby stated that this legislation is for easements to facilitate the completion of a bikepath connection along Hyland-Croy Road. This is one of six property owners whose properties will be impacted.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher moved to dispense with the public hearing and treat as emergency legislation.

Vice Mayor Gerber seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes.

Vote on the Ordinance: Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Ms. Salay, yes.

Ordinance 122-14

Amending Annual Appropriations for the Fiscal Year Ending December 31, 2014.

Mr. Lecklider introduced the ordinance.

Ms. Mumma stated that this is the final amendment to the 2014 appropriations. This legislation is brought forward each year as a housekeeping measure related to projects that were funded through Council actions this year. Many of the amendments are TIF related, so those expenditures would be repaid from the service payments received. There are two requests in this ordinance that are related to projects that were anticipated to be funded in 2015 – one relates to the road salt purchase and the other is related to a sewer improvement project. Legislation will be proposed in 2015 to unappropriate the funds.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher moved to dispense with the public hearing.

Ms. Salay seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes.

Vote on the Ordinance: Mr. Peterson, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Ms. Salay, yes.

OTHER

- **Grounds of Remembrance Maintenance Improvements**

Mr. Hahn stated that in Council's packet, maintenance recommendations were provided for the Grounds of Remembrance.

1. There have been issues with maintenance of the loose aggregate path. The recommendation is to replace the loose limestone with an exposed aggregate concrete path still using the limestone for that project.
2. Use a charcoal gray paint to highlight the inscriptions on the dedication pavers. Those have not been as readable as expected with age. The charcoal gray epoxy paint will give the right level of contrast to the lettering.
3. Use the same charcoal gray paint to highlight the letters of the Dublin Veterans Park signage that faces Dublin Road.
4. Within the project, there is an interior handrail that was initially considered necessary to meet ADA requirements, but with the exposed concrete path, we would remain in ADA compliance even with removal of the handrail.

Mr. Hahn noted that if approved, the renovation bid documents would be prepared and the project sent out for bid as soon as possible.

Mayor Keenan thanked Mr. Hahn for his effort to address the issue, as there have been many citizen inquiries. He believes the solutions recommended are excellent. He assumes they have been vetted with the artist.

Mr. Hahn responded that they have definitely vetted them with the artist. Using the limestone that is currently in the path as the aggregate in the exposed concrete path is a good way of allowing some of that original design intention to carry through in this renovation. It would actually be more economical to start over than to use the current inscribed pavers.

Mayor Keenan inquired if the pavers would be returned to the owners.

Mr. Hahn responded affirmatively.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher inquired if the handrailing that will be removed also includes the pedestals.

Mr. Hahn responded that the entire rail system including pedestals would be removed.

Mr. Reiner asked if the paint is actually an epoxy.

Mr. Hahn responded that it is an epoxy. He has a sample, if anyone would like to see it.

Mr. Reiner inquired if the epoxy brings the seal up to the face level of the brick.

Mr. Hahn responded that it does not -- the engraved inscription remains. [*sample of brick displayed*]. Mr. Hahn stated that there was some concern that a freeze/thaw cycle would cause some edges of the inscriptions to break off. The City has not experienced much of an issue with that, but the epoxy coating inside the inscriptions should completely eliminate it as an ongoing issue.

Vice Mayor Gerber stated that Mr. Hahn's work on this issue is appreciated.

Vice Mayor Gerber moved to approve the staff recommendations for maintenance improvements.

Ms. Salay seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mayor Keenan, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Ms. Salay, yes.

- **Discussion regarding Proposed Riverside Drive/Future John Shields Parkway Pedestrian Underpass**

Darren Meyer, MKSK, stated that in November, the potential for an underpass crossing under Riverside Drive at John Shields Parkway was reviewed. Council expressed a need to better understand the context of Riverside Drive and where that crossing would take place, and to have an update on some of the components considered at Riverside Drive.

He will review the context of the Riverside Drive design, some of the traffic-calming elements that will be incorporated into that design, and the three underpass options.

Context of the District

The presentation tonight will focus on the traffic-calming aspects of the plan and how they relate to each other and to pedestrians and cyclists crossing the roads [slide presentation shown of the existing Bridge Street District and different views of the streets as designed]. Roundabouts tend to be self-enforcing from a driver speed standpoint; there are fairly uniform speeds – 20 mph or less. From the speed reduction standpoint, the roundabout will have a great impact on traffic entering this portion of Riverside Drive from SR161 or from the south. Riverside Drive will be realigned to the east to accommodate a park along the river, and will tie back into the existing road alignment just south of I-270. Ms. Bishop will be providing an update on the progress of the portion of John Shields Parkway and the Dale-Tuller connection currently under construction. The view he is displaying shows the street network in the District at full buildout, which includes two future bridge crossings over the Scioto River – the pedestrian bridge to the south and a vehicular connection at John Shields Parkway. These are very important links in marrying the east side of the District to the west side, and they are part of the internal loop road system. It will add great value to the District because it will touch virtually all of the developments and neighborhoods within the two square mile District and connect them to the core amenities – the river, the riverfront park and Historic Dublin. Because of that value, they are considered signature streets and creating a local design and finish on them will encourage the walkability and movement throughout the District.

Detailed View

Traffic calming attempts to meet two objectives – reduce speeds and increase driver attentiveness. Both of those can be achieved through one overarching strategy, which is to provide cues in the streetscape that signal a change in the prevailing road condition to the motorist. The cues set up the expectation that they will see something other than cars, i.e. pedestrians and cyclists. There is a visual feel to the driver that creates a sense of enclosure. Traffic engineering studies show that the visual feel impacts the speed and behavior of motorists.

- *On-street parking*

The current design includes 40 spaces on the west side/park side of Riverside Drive; 59 parking spaces will be on the east side within three blocks – for a total of nearly 100 on-street parking spaces along Riverside Drive. The on-street parking will reduce the apparent width of the street and create a feel of enclosure. The articulation of the cars themselves, entry and exit maneuvers from those cars and the visual impact of pedestrians – all of these cumulatively will result in drivers better maintaining speeds. Bumpouts extended at the end of the curbs at the end of those parking lanes will protect the parking bays and provide lane discipline in the area.

- *At-grade crossings*

Two at-grade crossings are provided for pedestrians to cross Riverside Drive to the park and the west side of the District. The bumpouts will also: (1) reduce the distance in crossing the street; (3) make pedestrians more visible to oncoming motorists. Alternative materials, such as brick, will be used in the intersections. That will provide a visual and experiential cue to the motorist to alert them this is a pedestrian area and to exercise caution. At the traffic signals for each of the intersections, under consideration is a protected pedestrian-only phase – no vehicular movements during that phase of the signals so that pedestrians can cross with more confidence.

- *Design aesthetics*

All of the streetscape, median, and parkscape will have tremendous and significant aesthetic, recreational and environmental value. From a traffic-calming standpoint, it creates a sense of enclosure and intimacy. The leaf canopy will create a light and shadow pattern on the road – texture that provides an additional visual cue for motorists. From a pedestrian standpoint, on the sidewalk it creates an additional buffer between moving traffic and the sidewalk zone.

- *Building placement*

The buildings represented are consistent with the early framework of planning and with the development proposals to date. Buildings that front the road with minimal setback create a sense of enclosure and have urban characteristics, which create the expectation that pedestrians will be present. Elements on the road itself, such as front doors, awnings and front entries result in motorists respecting that context and better observing appropriate driving speeds and behavior.

The elements just listed are the tools that will be used to convert a suburban arterial into a walkable City street, which pedestrians are comfortable crossing to access the riverside park and the west side of the District.

Ms. Salay inquired what the speed limit would be along this stretch of Riverside Drive. Ms. Bishop responded that as currently designed, it will initially be 40 mph, but as the area develops, the Ohio Revised Code allows municipalities to apply a lower speed per the prima facie speed of 35 mph. That will be the goal.

Mr. Meyer inquired if the process utilized with achieving a reduction in speed limit involves some measurement of traffic speeds on that roadway.

Ms. Bishop responded that would not be a factor in this case. There is actually Ohio Revised Code that allows for speed reduction in developed areas. City Council could pass an ordinance setting the speed limit at 35 mph; it would not have to go through a speed limit study, as it would in the current setting.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher requested clarification of the proposed on-street parking in the context of Riverside Drive's current alignment.

Mr. Meyer responded that the current Digger and Finch building sits inboard just west of the Riverside Drive alignment.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that if the parking is there, then the road would be just to the east of it, correct?

Mr. Meyer responded affirmatively.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that it is difficult to envision. The design appears to be similar to Front Street, except on-street parking is not permitted there.

Mr. Meyer responded that on-street parking is permitted there except during peak hours.

Mr. Meyer stated that a better example would be Riverside Drive/Dublin Road as it moves into downtown Columbus, where North Bank Park is. There, you find the bumpouts to protect the parking lane. It is the same state route, so it is possible to get a sense of what it would look like.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that she has noticed pedestrians crossing, even though there are five or six lanes of traffic. There is a traffic light there; yet here there will be no traffic signal.

Mr. Meyer responded that the benefit of this proposal is that both John Shields Parkway and Bridge Park Avenue will have signals from the outset. At North Bank Park, the signal at Hanover has not been activated, so there is only the signal at Neil Avenue. This proposal will have a slight advantage over that condition.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher inquired if there would be traffic signals.

Mr. Meyer responded affirmatively.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher noted that there doesn't seem to be sufficient distance for two signals.

Mr. Meyer responded that there is approximately 1,100 feet.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher inquired if the signals would work automatically as programmed, or would they be activated by pedestrians when they wish to cross.

Mr. Meyer responded that the traffic signals would be activated by pedestrians and default to green light. The crossing from Bridge Park Avenue and John Shields Parkway will be the primary access of users from the east side of the Bridge Street District to the river park and west side of the District. From a planning perspective, they have considered an underpass under Riverside Drive, which is a major arterial. Public concern and a desire for that option has been expressed. Some factors determine the location of an underpass connection:

- (1) The footprint of the pedestrian bridge – because it must go under the road, a ramp or stairs are necessary for access.
- (2) The proposed Crawford-Hoying development at Bridge Park Avenue – Because of the level of retail with the mixed use, the connection to the pedestrian bridge, and the vibrancy and the amount of space needed to accommodate those types of uses, the real estate here is very valuable.
- (3) John Shields Parkway, as it is currently conceived, is a little less intensely developed with retail and restaurants.
- (4) There is a publicly owned greenspace here, which provides the needed real estate to make the grade change under the road.

Proposed options:

Option A: a ramp system leading from the corner of John Shields Parkway down and under the road.

Con – This option would significantly impact the greenway and the ability of a building there to address a street on the corner.

Pro – This option provides the most gradual and universally accessible route from the street grade down and under the street into the park.

Option B: maintain a tunnel under Riverside Drive, with access only by stairs. This is an improvement over the Option A footprint; this option leaves the greenspace more intact and there is more ability for the building to address the corner. There are some tradeoffs with the stairs, however. The potential users, which would include elderly and young children, would have a less comfortable street crossing; it will be necessary to navigate 30 steps down to the underpass. There is some question how much it would be used, as there will also be an accessible at-grade street crossing to the park. A ramp would be redundant.

Option C: no tunnel under road.

Mr. Lecklider inquired if there is a natural grade change from the west to the east, or will there be excavation on the west side at the tunnel entrance.

Mr. Meyer responded that there will be some excavation, although the design does take advantage of the natural fall to the river.

Mr. Lecklider inquired if people wanting to cross at-grade from the west side would also have steps to climb.

Mr. Meyer responded that there will be both a ramp and stairs to move from the park to the street crossing.

Mr. Lecklider inquired how many steps would be on the west side.

Mr. Meyer responded that it will be approximately the same amount.

Mr. Lecklider noted that it will then be necessary to use stairs on both the east and west sides, along with the ramp.

Mr. Reiner inquired if there will also be an underpass tunnel at the pedestrian bridge.

Mr. Meyer responded that there will not. Only one location is proposed.

Mr. Reiner stated that he believes the most important location is at the pedestrian bridge, because it is the link that will tie together both sides of the river.

Mr. Meyer responded that there were some concerns with that option:

1. Access from the ramp and stairs to the bridge is less convenient, and
2. The proposed location is more valuable due to the Crawford Hoying development on that corner and the signature intersection at Bridge Park Avenue.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher inquired if Option B is recommended.

Mr. Meyer responded that Option B seems to strike the best balance between the pros and cons.

Mr. Lecklider inquired what would be the width of the tunnel.

Mr. Meyer responded that it would be 14 feet.

Mr. Lecklider inquired if there are existing tunnels in Dublin with approximately the same width.

Mr. Meyer responded that that this tunnel is probably wider than the existing tunnels.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that she prefers Option B. Option C concerns her, as not everyone would be comfortable crossing a main road. This will provide another option.

Ms. Grigsby stated that concerns have been expressed regarding pedestrians with strollers. Ramps will provide an option for them as well as bicyclists.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher agreed. In addition, it will be less difficult for ice and snow removal.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher moved approval of Option B, as outlined in the staff report of November 2014.

Mr. Lecklider seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Peterson, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes.

Mr. Meyer stated that there are two traffic light standards used in the City. The smaller traffic light is used in the Historic District; the other is used in the rest of the District. There have been some concerns regarding whether this is architecturally appropriate for the Bridge Street District. Their proposal is for two fixtures in the District. The smaller, pedestrian-scale fixture would be used on all of the two-lane roads, which is the vast majority of the roads in the network, with the exception of Riverside Drive, SR 161 and some of the larger arterials. The second option would be used for the larger arterials. The lamps for both fixtures are from the same lamp series, however. Consensus of Council was to approve the recommended fixtures.

- **Maintenance of Traffic – Riverside Drive/SR 161 Roundabout Project**

Ms. Callaghan that in September, staff shared information about several major construction projects planned in 2015, including the Riverside Drive realignment and the Riverside Drive/SR 161 intersection improvement, which is a roundabout. Options have been explored for maintenance of traffic during this project and recommendations have been developed. In September, with a 40% developed plan, it was anticipated that a full closure of the SR 161/Riverside Drive intersection would be necessary. At that that time, Council requested staff to evaluate (1) alternatives to closing the intersection, and (2) opportunities to expedite construction.

- Updated plans (approximately 60%) were received from the design consultant in October, and 90% developed plans are anticipated yet this month. There is now sufficient detail to determine construction sequencing, so plans for maintenance of traffic can be better evaluated and defined. Staff has reviewed the plans and evaluated traffic maintenance alternatives. In regard, to expediting the projects – a memo was provided previously regarding exploration of innovative contracting methods. Construction of the Bridge Street District public improvement projects began in 2014. The Emerald Parkway connection opened last week. Construction of a signature street -- John Shields Parkway and the Dale Drive-Tuller Ridge connector began in the summer of 2014. Those roadways will be completed in spring 2015. In 2015, the Riverside Drive realignment and the SR161 roundabout will be constructed. Those two projects are designed as separate and distinct projects; however, they will be constructed under a single contract for ease of contract administration and ease of maintenance of traffic coordination.
- When the state route of Riverside Drive was built, it was built close to the edge of the river with no consideration given for access to the river. However, the river is an important amenity that the City needs to take advantage of. The SR161 intersection is signal-controlled with left turns onto Riverside Drive restricted since 1993. The intersection is the third highest crash location within the City.
- The infrastructure improvements will open up important parkland, re-construct the intersection as a new roundabout with restoration of all movements at that intersection. The new roundabout will accommodate traffic volumes well into the future and will have many aesthetically pleasing features.

Traffic during 2015 Construction

Option 1: Maintain one lane of through traffic in all directions with the exception of short-term closures, determined as the design is finalized. It does not maintain turning movements, however.

Option 2: Close SR161 traffic for 10 weeks; northbound and southbound traffic would be maintained on the bypass lane under the intersection. Early on, this was the preferred option. It was anticipated that with the closure of SR 161, it would be possible to get all lanes of traffic open in all directions in one season; that is now considered extremely unlikely. The closure would pose the risk of the bridge remaining closed throughout the winter and into the spring. Realistically, all lanes open in all directions would not happen until April 2016 under the closure scenario.

In comparison, Option 1, which maintains at least one lane of travel in all directions, results in all lanes of traffic in all directions open in June 2016 – only a couple of months longer. Based on a comparison of the impacts resulting from each option, staff recommends Option 1, which will maintain at least one lane of traffic in each direction on SR 161 and Riverside Drive for the duration of the project.

Ms. Bishop explained the traffic sequencing of the option:

1. In March 2015 – closure of bypass lane. Traffic will shift up to the existing intersection with all lanes and movement operational through June 2015.
2. June 2015 –construction commences in the westbound lanes (north side of intersection). The traffic would be restricted to one lane in each direction. One lane north and south will be maintained in the Riverside bypass lane.
3. Construction commences in the eastbound lanes (south side of intersection.) One lane east and west would be maintained on SR 161 within the new section of the roundabout. North and southbound traffic will be maintained on the Riverside bypass lane.
4. September 2015 – One lane east and west would be permitted through the roundabout. The realignment of Riverside Drive is under construction.
5. October 2015 – Four lanes open -- two eastbound/westbound lanes on SR 161. Maintenance of this traffic will continue until June 2016.
6. June 2016 – All lanes on Riverside Drive and SR161 are open. Only one lane on the Riverside Drive vehicular bypass lane, as well as a pedestrian path that connects to Kiwanis Park. Curbs, lighting and sidewalks will be constructed into fall 2016.

In summary, with Option 1, one lane in all directions will be maintained. All traffic movements will be open in June 2016, except by the bypass lane. Curb work will continue until October 2016 to finish the project.

Ms. Salay requested copies of the PowerPoint for Council members.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher noted that the rendering of the completed intersection should be posted at the City's website.

Mr. Lecklider moved approval of Option 1, as recommended by staff.

Mr. Peterson seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes.

STAFF COMMENTS

Ms. Grigsby reported that ODOT will begin tree clearing for the I-270/US 33 interchange project on January 5, to be completed by mid-March, when construction will be initiated.

COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS

• **Finance Committee recommendations for hotel/motel tax grants**

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher reported that the Finance Committee met on November 24 and reviewed the hotel/motel tax grant applications. Recommendations were provided in Council packets.

Mr. Chinnici-Zuercher moved to affirm the Committee recommendations for the following applications.

Approval

1. Dublin A.M. Rotary Blarney Bash - recommend \$10,000 up front for marketing, branding, logistics and up to \$10,000 for City services
2. Dublin Arts Council Placemaking - recommend grant of \$14,750
3. Dublin Robotics - recommend grant of \$1,500
4. Dublin United Soccer - recommend grant of up to \$4,000 for City services
5. Miracle League - recommend grant of 50 percent of submitted expenses – grant not to exceed \$15,000
6. Ohio Premier Soccer - recommend grant of up to \$8,500 for City services
7. Ohio Wildlife Center - recommend grant of \$35,700 as outlined in application with City recognition (plaque)
8. The OHIO Company (OU) Summer Theater Festival - recommend grant of \$10,000
9. Arthritis Foundation - recommend grant of \$10,000 for Police security and stage rental
10. DCVB Irish is an Attitude - recommend grant of \$7,500 (matching)
11. DCVB Top Gun - recommend grant of \$25,000 matching
12. Dublin Jerome Homecoming parade - recommend grant of \$1,000 for City services
13. Dublin Kiwanis Frog Jump - recommend grant of up to \$5,000 for City services
14. Dublin Soccer League - recommend grant of \$7,039 as outlined in application
15. DYA Wayne Williams Tournament - recommend grant of \$19,500 for City services
16. Club Ohio Soccer (2 events) - recommend grant of \$13,000 as outlined in application
17. DSHS Lacrosse Boosters - recommend grant of \$7,000 as outlined in application
18. Dublin Special Olympics - recommend grant of \$6,000 as outlined in application
19. National Intercollegiate Flying Association - recommend grant of \$10,000 as outlined in application
20. Historic Dublin Business Association Community Engagement - recommend grant of \$25,000

Mr. Reiner seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher moved to affirm the Committee recommendations for denial of the following applications.

Disapproval

1. Safe Alliance of Interfaith Leaders
2. Dublin City Schools Emerald City Music Games
3. DWC Philanthropic Old Dublin Pub Crawl
4. DWC Philanthropic Memorial Tournament Meet the Spouses Luncheon

Mayor Keenan seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes.

• **Administrative Committee**

Vice Mayor Gerber, Chair stated that Council has been working on the selection of a new City Manager, which as announced tonight will be Mr. Dana McDaniel. The expectation is that there will be a resolution for approval of the new City Manager contract on the January 5 Council agenda.

• **Public Services Committee**

Ms. Salay, Chair requested that Council refer the matter of private homeowner association (HOA) maintenance responsibilities to the Public Services Committee. Some time has passed since Council last considered this matter, and there have been requests from HOAs

for relief. The Final Plat included on tonight's Consent Agenda provided for the HOA to be responsible for their maintenance with the exception of stormwater retention ponds and associated infrastructure, which would be maintained by the City. This arrangement is different than earlier HOA maintenance arrangements.

It was the consensus of Council to refer to the Public Services Committee the matter of private Homeowner Association maintenance responsibilities for various items - meeting to be scheduled in early 2015.

- **Dublin Arts Council Representative**

Mr. Reiner provided the report from the DAC quarterly meeting.

- ADAMH will be funding the creation of a mural in the bike tunnel near Bailey Elementary. Public meetings will begin in January, a conceptual plan will be completed by April and construction will occur in June-July 2015.
- The City has 33 entries listed in the national database of the Public Art Archives – one of the largest.
- Work is in progress on the "Where to Go" public art tour – a mobile app. The organization continually makes efforts to secure funding for projects.
- A grant application for \$200,000 has been submitted for a hosting a "bread festival." There are only two other such festivals – one in Europe and one in the U.S.

- **US 33 Corridor**

Ms. Grigsby reported that a meeting was held last week. So far, the meetings have focused on accumulation of information on the existing and future land uses of the various jurisdictions. Last week, the discussion centered on the topic of overlays within the area and the planning elements, specifically the importance of the infrastructure within the area being reviewed. It is important that as developments occur, jurisdictions do not lose opportunities to include the infrastructure. At the next meeting, the goal is to have William Murdoch, MORPC, discuss Insight 2050, which focuses on the fiscal impact of the development process. This issue is important in the US33 Corridor area.

Mr. Lecklider stated that he, Ms. Grigsby and the Mayor should have a discussion about the City's representation with this group. Would it be possible to hold future meetings in Dublin?

Ms. Grigsby responded that the meeting site rotates. Dublin hosted the May meeting.

COUNCIL ROUNDTABLE

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher:

1. Reported on the OML Board meeting held last Thursday. Board discussion focused on the HB 5 Substitute bill, now approved. Ms. Gibson will be providing a synopsis of the bill and its anticipated impact on the City.
2. Thanked Mr. Hahn for the report in Council packets on the Miracle League playground expansion. This is the largest Miracle League program in the country. As the information indicates, there are sponsorship opportunities for the development of a Special Olympics Miracle League area. She encouraged Council members to share with their businesses and friends. There is a flyer in the packet.

Vice Mayor Gerber noted that it would be helpful to have additional flyers to distribute.

3. Inquired when Mr. Grabill will be receiving certification for the nursing facility.

Ms. Grigsby responded that it will depend upon when the facility is completed. Originally anticipated at the end of 2014, it will probably occur near the end of the first quarter in 2015, perhaps in April. Building Standards staff have been meeting with them regularly to coordinate steps for occupancy approval.

Mr. Lecklider thanked staff for all their lengthy preparations, which were necessary for this meeting tonight.

Mayor Keenan thanked staff and past and present Councils for all the work on Emerald Parkway over the years. He congratulated Ms. Grigsby, who has been here throughout the 18-year process.

Vice Mayor Gerber reported that the third class of the Citizens Police Academy will be graduating at 6 p.m. this Thursday, December 11, at the Dublin Recreation Center.

He wished everyone a happy holiday!

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Mayor – Presiding Officer

Clerk of Council